

Application/Control Number: 09/872,245
Art Unit: 2178

Docket No.: PALM-3666

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the forgoing proposed amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

By this proposed amendment, claims 1, 12 and 21 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and dependent claims 5, 15 and 22 are amended to be in independent form to include the features of claim 1, 12 or 21, respectively. Applicant further proposes amending claims 2-5 and 6-11 to depend from claim 5, amending claims 13, 14 and 16-20 to depend from claim 15, and claims 23 and 24 to depend from claim 22. Additionally, Applicant proposes adding the word "to" to line 2 of claim 20 to improve the form of claim 20.

Rejection of Claims 1, 3 and 9

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,583,543 to Takahashi et al. ("Takahashi"). Applicant proposes canceling claim 1 without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby making the rejection moot with respect to claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn. Applicant submits that the amended claims obviate the rejection.

Proposed amended claims 3 and 9 depend from proposed amended claim 5, which is directed to a computer implemented method of implementing a touchscreen user interface for a computer system. According to claim 5, the method includes, among other things, implementing in-place editing by replacing one or more previously recognized characters of a portion of recognized text in a first touchscreen area with newly recognized one or more characters by recognizing new text input strokes made over the one or more previously recognized characters.

Application/Control Number: 09/872,245
Art Unit: 2178

Docket No.: PALM-3666

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Takahashi, at col. 9, lines 32-35, col. 10, lines 37-39, and col. 10, lines 51-60, discloses this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Takahashi, at col. 9, lines 32-35, discloses:

More specifically, in a case of the gesture command for deleting one character, a basic stroke corresponds to a line drawing which is drawn like character V from the left to the right.

Thus, Takahashi discloses that a gesture command that is similar to drawing a V, from left to right, is a command for deleting one character (Also, see Takahashi, at col. 11, lines 24-34, and Figs. 4(a) and 4(b)).

Takahashi, at col. 10, lines 37-39, with respect to Fig. 3(b), discloses:

First, as shown in FIG. 3(b), a line drawing having a shape like "A", which indicates the handwriting inputting of characters, is drawn from a substantial center of character "f" as a base point (pen-down point).

Thus, Takahashi discloses that a command gesture that is similar to an "A" places the device into an insert mode in which characters may be inserted beginning at a point as indicated by a point where the "A" shape is drawn (See Takahashi, at Figs. 3(a), 3(b) and 3(c), and col. 10, lines 32-46).

Takahashi, at col. 10, lines 51-60, discloses:

The handwritten recognition-use inputting board 24 has the window 22 as the handwriting input area. The window 22 has, for example, a five-character space. The frame data for displaying a border-line is generated by the text editing section 38. When character "v" is written, as shown in FIG. 3(c), in a first inputting area of the window 22, the trace coordinate of character "v" is extracted by the trace coordinate extracting section 33. (1) The image which is drawn by the trace drawing section 34 in accordance with the extracted trace coordinates and (2) the image which is currently displayed on the screen 21 are synthesized by the bit map memory 35 so as to output the synthesized data to the display 31. Thus, each character, which is written by the input pen 16, is simultaneously displayed on the screen 21.

The above-cited portion of Takahashi refers to the insertion of the word "very" as shown in Fig. 3(c) of Takahashi. Thus, the "v" above is not the same as the command gesture "V" indicating

Application/Control Number: 09/872,245
Art Unit: 2178

Docket No.: PALM-3666

deletion of one character.

Applicant submits that Takahashi discloses deleting one or more characters and inserting one or more characters, but does not disclose or suggest replacing one or more characters.

Therefore, Takahashi fails to disclose or suggest implementing in-place editing by replacing one or more previously recognized characters of a portion of recognized text in a first touchscreen area with newly recognized one or more characters by recognizing new text input strokes made over the one or more previously recognized characters, as required by claim 5 and dependent claims 3 and 9.

Because Takahashi fails to disclose each and every feature of claim 5 and dependent claims 3 and 9, Applicant submits that claims 3 and 9 are not anticipated by Takahashi and respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 3 and 9 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 2 and 5

On pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Takahashi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,256,009 to Lui et al. ("Lui"). Applicant traverses the rejection with respect to claim 5 and submits that proposed amended claim 2 obviates the rejection.

As discussed above, with respect to the rejection of claims 1, 3 and 9, claim 5 is not anticipated by Takahashi. Lui fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Takahashi. Therefore, Takashi and Lui fail to disclose or suggest, either separately or in combination, each and every feature of claim 5 and dependent claim 2. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2 and 5 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 4

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

Application/Control Number: 09/872,245
Art Unit: 2178

Docket No.: PALM-3666

allegedly being unpatentable over Takahashi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,546,538 to Cobbley et al. ("Cobbley"). Applicant submits that proposed amended claim 4 obviates the rejection.

Proposed amended claim 4 depends from proposed amended claim 5, which is not anticipated by Takahashi for at least the reasons discussed previously. Applicant submits that Cobbley also fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Takahashi. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 4 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 6, 8, 10 and 11

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6, 8, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Takahashi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,760,773 to Berman et al. ("Berman"). Applicant submits that the proposed amended claims obviate the rejection.

Proposed amended claims 6, 8, 10 and 11 depend from proposed amended claim 5, which is not anticipated by Takahashi for at least the reasons discussed previously. Applicant submits that Berman also fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Takahashi. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 6, 8, 10 and 11 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 7

On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Takahashi in view of published U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0143831 to Bennett. Applicant submits that amended claim 7 obviates the rejection.

Proposed amended claim 7 depends from proposed amended claim 5, which is not anticipated by Takahashi for at least the reasons discussed previously. Applicant submits that Bennett also fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Takahashi. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 7 be withdrawn.

Application/Control Number: 09/872,245
Art Unit: 2178

Docket No.: PALM-3666

Rejection of Claims 12, 13, 15, 16, 18 and 20-24

On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 12, 13, 15, 16, 18 and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Takahashi, Berman and Lui. Applicants submit that the proposed amended claims obviate the rejection with respect to claims 13, 16, 18, 20, 23 and 24. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection with respect to claims 15 and 22. Applicant proposes canceling claims 12 and 21 without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby making the rejection of claims 12 and 21 moot. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 12 and 21 be withdrawn.

Proposed amended claims 15 and 22 recite features similar to proposed amended claim 5 and are not anticipated by Takahashi for at least similar reasons. Applicant submits that Berman and Lui fail to satisfy the deficiencies of Takahashi. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claims 15, 22 and dependent claims 13, 16, 18, 20, 23 and 24 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 14

On page 13 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Takahashi, Berman, Lui and Cobbley. Applicant submits that amended claim 14 obviates the rejection.

As previously discussed, Takahashi fails to anticipate proposed amended independent claim 15, from which proposed amended claim 14 depends. Applicant submits that Berman and Lui fail to satisfy the deficiencies of Takahashi. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 19

Application/Control Number: 09/872,245
Art Unit: 2178

Docket No.: PALM-3666

On page 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Takahashi, Berman and Lui. Applicant submits that proposed amended claim 19 obviates the rejection.

Proposed amended claim 19 depends from proposed amended claim 15, which is not anticipated by Takahashi for at least the reasons discussed previously. Applicant submits that Berman and Lui also fail to satisfy the deficiencies of Takahashi. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 17

On page 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Takahashi, Berman, Lui and Bennett. Applicant submits that proposed amended claim 17 obviates the rejection.

Proposed amended claim 17 depends from proposed amended claim 15, which is not anticipated by Takahashi for at least the reasons discussed previously. Applicant submits that Berman, Lui and Bennett also fail to satisfy the deficiencies of Takahashi. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 17 be withdrawn.

Application/Control Number: 09/872,245
Art Unit: 2178

Docket No.: PALM-3666

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections, Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed amendments place the subject application in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the proposed amendments and allowance of the subject application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 31, 2005

By: Richard C. Irving

Correspondence Address:

Cust. No. 49637
Berry & Associates, P.C.
9255 Sunset Boulevard, Suite 810
Los Angeles, CA 90069
Phone: (310) 247-2860
Fax: (310) 247-2864

Richard C. Irving
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,499
Phone: 410-414-3056